

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

MIGUEL ANGEL DIAZ,	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	
Petitioner,	:	2:02-CV-04454
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
JOHN ASHCROFT, EDWARD MCELROY,	:	
KENNETH ELWOOD, and the	:	
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION	:	
SERVICE,	:	
	:	
Respondents.	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this day of February, 2003, upon
consideration of the Petitioner's Motion for Reconsideration
(Document No. 8), it is hereby ORDERED that the Motion is
DENIED.¹

¹ "The purpose of a motion for reconsideration is to correct manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence." Max's Seafood Cafe v. Quinteros, 176 F.3d 669, 677 (3d Cir. 1999). "Under Rule 59(e), a party [seeking reconsideration] must rely on one of three grounds: (1) the availability of new evidence not previously available, (2) an intervening change in controlling law, or (3) the need to correct a clear error of law or to prevent manifest injustice." Moy v. M&T Mortgage Corp., No. CIV.A. 01-5693, 2002 WL 1001146, * 1 (E.D. Pa. May 15, 2002) (citing Smith v. City of Chester, 155 F.R.D. 95, 96-97 (E.D. Pa. 1994)).

On December 4, 2002, this Court entered an Order granting Respondents' Motion to Lift Stay of Removal. Petitioner now moves for reconsideration of this Order. However, Petitioner has not asserted any of the required grounds justifying reconsideration; in fact, Plaintiff has not even addressed the legal standard governing motions for reconsideration. Since Petitioner has not set forth any reason why this Court should reconsider its prior decision to lift the stay of removal, Petitioner's Motion for Reconsideration is DENIED.

BY THE COURT:

J. CURTIS JOYNER, J.